

REMARKS

In the Office Action of June 22, 2010, claims 1, 20, 37 and 59-67 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,975,425 (“Abe et al.”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,796,401 (“Winer”). In addition, claims 1-10, 14-28, 32-46, 50-55 and 59-60 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Abe et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,841,435 (“Dauerer et al.”).

In response, Applicant has amended the independent claims 1, 20 and 37 to more clearly distinguish the claimed invention from the cited references. In view of the amendments to the claims, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims 1-10, 14-28, 32-46, 50-55 and 59-67 are now in condition for allowance.

A. Patentability of Amended Independent Claims 1, 20 and 37

As amended, the independent claim 1 recites the limitation of *“said geometric object defining an area of said display device to be printed on a selected print medium such that only portions of said graphic objects within said area defined by said geometric object are printed on a single sheet of print medium when said geometric object is selected to be printed,”* which is not disclosed in the cited reference of Abe et al., as asserted in the Office Action. Thus, the amended independent claim 1 is not obvious over Abe et al. in view of Winer or over Abe et al. in view of Dauerer et al. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the amended independent claim 1 be allowed.

The Office Action on pages 3 and 4 alleges that Abe et al. discloses “said geometric object defining an area of said display device to be printed on a selected print medium (see column 11, line 55 – column 14, line 60; figures 10, 13-15, 22-25).” The claimed “geometric object” has been equated to the geometric shape shown in Fig. 22 of Abe et al., i.e., the rectangle. This geometric shape is used for selecting objects to extract contour information for printing. However, the geometric shape described in Abe et al. does not define an area *“such that only portions of said graphic objects within said area*

defined by said geometric object are printed on a single sheet of print medium when said geometric object is selected to be printed,” as recited in the independent claim 1. Thus, each limitation of the independent claim 1 is not taught even if the teachings of Abe et al. are combined with the teachings of Winer or Dauerer et al. in the manner suggested in the Office Action. Thus, the amended independent claim 1 is not obvious over Abe et al. in view of Winer or over Abe et al. in view of Dauerer et al. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the amended independent claim 1 be allowed.

The above remarks are also applicable to the amended independent claims 20 and 37, which recite similar limitations as those of the amended independent claim 1. Thus, these amended independent claims 20 and 37 are also not obvious in view of the cited references. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the amended independent claims 20 and 37 be allowed as well.

B. Patentability of Dependent Claims 2-10, 14-19, 21-28, 32-36, 38-46, 50-55 and 59-67

Each of the dependent claims 2-10, 14-19, 21-28, 32-36, 38-46, 50-55 and 59-67 depends on one of the amended independent claims 1, 20 and 37. As such, these dependent claims include all the limitations of their respective base claims. Therefore, Applicant submits that these dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims.

Applicant respectfully requests a notice of allowance in view of the claim amendments and the remarks made herein.

5

Respectfully submitted,
Denny Jaeger

Date: December 22, 2010

10

By: /thomas h. ham/
Thomas H. Ham
Registration No. 43,654
Telephone: (925) 249-1300